

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final office action, claims 1, 6-14, 15, 20-26, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lamming, et al. (US 6,922,725) in view of Cocotis, et al. (US 20030078965). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits in the office action that Lamming fails to teach a method for providing a visitor safe wireless print access point, the method comprising: wherein the wireless computing device is permitted to access the available printer in the secure wired network and is prevented from accessing a secure device in the secure wired network; establishing a print path through the spooling device to the selected printer; sending a print job via the wireless network to the spooling device; spooling the print job on the spooling device; and sending the print job via the secure wired network to a selected printer from the available printers. In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies of Lamming, the Examiner relies on Cocotis in an attempt to show various features.

Lamming is directed to an apparatus/method for processing a document service request from a mobile computing device.

Cocotis is directed to a system where a user will provide the login data (via any supported access device) into the system (see Cocotis, paragraph 0196) so that the user is validated. If the validation of the user fails, then the user is prevented from logging into the system. The user can select (via user interface 76 in Figure 19 of

Cocotis) an available printer D1 that can render a print job request, where the available printer D1 is managed by in a network zone (Zone 0) which is a network with an optional firewall 61. Therefore, in Cocotis, a user can access the available printer D1 in a network zone (Zone 0) as discussed in paragraphs 0205-0206 of Cocotis. Cocotis does not disclose a secured device (in the same network zone (Zone 0)) that the user is not permitted to access. As discussed above, in the system of Cocotis, once the user is successfully validated by the system, the user will be able to access all devices in the system (see Cocotis, paragraph 0196). The system does not include a secured device that a successfully validated user is prevented to access. Therefore, Cocotis does not disclose a secure device in the network zone (Zone 0) that the user is prevented from accessing when the user has been permitted to access the available printer D1 in the same network zone (Zone 0). Therefore, Cocotis does not disclose and does not suggest the features of *"wherein the wireless computing device is permitted to access the available printer in the secure wired network and is prevented from accessing a secure device in the secure wired network"* (emphasis added), as substantially recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the Lamming-Cocotis combination does not disclose and does not suggest the features of *"wherein the wireless computing device is permitted to access the available printer in the secure wired network and is prevented from accessing a secure device in the secure wired network"*, as substantially recited in claim 1. Claims 15 and 31 also recite similar features that are not

disclosed and are not suggested by the cited Lamming-Cocotis combination. Accordingly, claims 1, 15, and 31 are each patentable over the Lamming-Cocotis combination.

Claims 6-14 and 20-26 depend from claims 1 and 15, respectively, and are each patentable over the combination of Lamming and Cocotis for at least the same reasons that their respective base claims are each patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, each of the claims 6-14 and 20-26 distinguishes over the combination of Lamming and Cocotis by reciting additional features in combination with the features that are recited in their respective base claims. For example, claim 8 recites the features of "*downloading a printer driver from the spooling device to the wireless device*" and claim 22 recites the features of "*wherein the spooling device is configured to download a printer driver to the wireless device*". In contrast, the section in Lamming as cited by the Examiner instead discloses the different feature of downloading a printer driver to the document server 108 (Lamming, column 10, lines 60-63). Lamming does not disclose downloading a printer driver to a wireless device as substantially recited in claims 8 and 22. Accordingly, claims 6-14 and 20-26 are each patentable over the combination of Lamming and Cocotis.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the office action, claims 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over

Lamming, in view of Cocotis and Fong (US 20050243777). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits in the office action that Lamming fails to teach an apparatus for providing a visitor safe wireless print access point comprising: a spooling device configured to download a printer driver and a printer driver information to the wireless computing device; and wherein the spooling device is configured to check a packet from the wireless computing device in order to determine if the wireless computing device is attempting to connect to an available printer in a secure wired network, and to transmit the packet to the spooling device if the packet is an allowed packet, so that the wireless computing device can be used to print via the available printer in the secure wired network if the wireless computing device is permitted to access the available printer in the secure wired network, and wherein the wireless computing device is prevented from accessing a secure device in the secure wired network. In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies of Lamming, the Examiner relies on Cocotis and Fong in an attempt to show various features.

As discussed above, Cocotis does not disclose and does not suggest the features of a wireless computing device that is permitted to access an available printer in the secure wired network and is prevented from accessing a secure device in the same secure wired network.

Fong discloses a main server 300 that authenticates the mobile terminal 306. If the mobile terminal 306 is successfully authenticated by the main server 300, the

mobile terminal 306 can access all resources of the main server 300. The main server 300 will not have any secure device that is not accessible by the mobile terminal 306, when the mobile terminal 306 has been successfully authenticated and has been permitted to access the resources of the main server 300. Therefore, the main server 300 will either permit full access to all resources/devices or no access to all resources/devices, depending on whether or not the mobile terminal 306 is successfully authenticated. Therefore, Fong does not disclose an apparatus that permits access to some resources in a secure wired network and prevent access to other resources in the same secure wired network. Therefore, the Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination does not disclose and does not suggest the feature of *"the wireless computing device can be used to print via the available printer in the secure wired network if the wireless computing device is permitted to access the available printer in the secure wired network, and wherein the wireless computing device is prevented from accessing a secure device in the secure wired network"*, as substantially recited in claim 27. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over the Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination.

Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and are each patentable over Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination for at least the same reasons that claim 27 is patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, each of the claims 28-30 distinguishes over the combination of Lamming-Cocotis-Fong by reciting additional features in combination with the features that

are recited in their respective base claim. Accordingly, claims 28-30 are each patentable over the combination of Lamming, Cocotis and Fong.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the office action claims 2-5, and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lamming and Cocotis as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of Fong. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits in the office action that the Lamming-Cocotis combination fails to teach various features that are noted in the final office action. In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies of the Lamming-Cocotis combination, the Examiner relies on Fong in an attempt to show various features.

As similarly discussed above, claims 1 and 15 each recites various features that are not disclosed and are not suggested by the Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination. Claims 2-5 and 16-19 depend from claims 1 and 15, respectively, and are each patentable over the Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination for at least the same reasons that their respective base claim is patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, each of the claims 2-5 and 16-19 distinguishes over the combination of Lamming-Cocotis-Fong by reciting additional features in combination with the features that are recited in their respective base claim. Accordingly,

claims 2-5 and 16-19 are each patentable over the Lamming-Cocotis-Fong combination.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

Since September 14, 2008 falls on a Sunday, this response is being filed on the following business day.